	Case 2:11-cv-01918-PMP-PAL Document 8 Filed 04/26/12 Page 1 of 2
1 2	
3	
4	
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
7	HERMAN L. BARTON,) Case No. 2:11-cv-01918-PMP-PAL
8	Plaintiff,)
9	vs. PREPORT OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION
10	CITY OF LAS VEGAS,
11	Defendant.
12	
13	Plaintiff Herman L. Barton is proceeding in this action <i>pro se</i> . Because the court granted
14	Plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis, the court screened the pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).
15	The undersigned entered an Order (Dkt. #6) on March 14, 2012, screening Plaintiff's Complaint,
16	finding it failed to state a claim, and allowing Plaintiff thirty days to file an amended complaint.
17	Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint, requested an extension of time, or taken any other action
18	to prosecute this case. Plaintiff was warned that failure to comply with the Screening Order would
19	result in a recommendation to the District Judge that this case be dismissed.
20	Accordingly,
21	IT IS THE RECOMMENDATION of the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge that
22	the Complaint (Dkt. #6) be DISMISSED.
23	Dated this 26th day of April, 2012.
24	
25	Jugan a. Feen
26	PEGGY A LEEN
27	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28	

NOTICE

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the court. Pursuant to Local Rule of Practice (LR) IB 3-2(a), any party wishing to object to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge shall file and serve *specific written objections* together with points and authorities in support of those objections, within fourteen days of the date of service of the findings and recommendations. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." The parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's Order. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). The points and authorities filed in support of the specific written objections are subject to the page limitations found in LR 7-4.